States Postal Service submitted a request, in accordance with section 802(c) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act, to the Postal Regulatory Commission, PRC, calling for an independent and objective review of the methods used to allocate benefit liabilities between the Postal Service and the Federal government under generally accepted actuarial practices and principles.

The independent actuarial firm hired by the PRC, The Segal Company, determined that the current methodology used by the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, for allocating such retirement benefits between the United States Postal Service and the Federal government follows an antiquated methodology that fails to incorporate current actuarial best practices and accounting standards as recognized and codified by the Financial Accounting Standard Board.

Accordingly, to remedy this unjust treatment, this legislation I am introducing today directs OPM to update and modernize the actuarial methodology to be used in allocating CSRS retirement benefit liabilities between the United States Postal Service and the Federal government in accordance with The Segal Company's recommendation. Under this approach, the Federal government's portion of an individual's CSRS annuity will be based on the CSRS benefit accrual formula and the conventional individual's ''high-3'' average salary. By utilizing this methodology, this legislation will ensure that OPM is using modern actuarial practices and accounting standards to apportion the benefit liabilities that are codified by the independent Financial Accounting Standard Board under FASB ASC 715.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

SPEECH OF

### HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 1, 2010*

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Lee Amendment.

The war in Afghanistan is now the longest in our nation's history. It has cost the lives of over 1,150 American soldiers, hundreds of allied troops and scores of Afghan civilians. It has drained our nation's Treasury at a time of immense domestic challenges. It has strained our relationships with allies in the fight against terrorism. And it is making us less safe, not more, by inciting anti-American sentiment across the world.

I supported this war at its outset. After the horror of September 11th, our nation faced a clear need to strike the Taliban and the Al Qaeda operatives it supported. While I disagreed with the Bush administration's conduct of the war, I believe President Obama has tried to make a decisive effort to improve the situation and chart a course for bringing our troops home.

However, the Afghan government has proved to be inadequate to the tasks before it. President Karzai has not proven to be a trustworthy partner. Flawed elections, rampant corruption, missing money, and a lack of accountability have crippled international efforts to establish the rule of law. This is a fundamental problem of governance, and a problem that the continued presence and heroic efforts of our troops cannot change.

In 2007, I cast a similar vote to advance redeployment from Iraq as it was clear to me that the Iraqi government would only begin to chart a path towards stability once it realized that our commitment was not open-ended. I look forward to the completion of our redeployment from Iraq by the end of next year.

Today, as we determine the future of our commitment to Afghanistan we must pledge not to completely disappear from involvement in Afghanistan, but neither should we be willing to commit to the indefinite task of nation-building with a government that has proven an unwilling and incapable partner. Although I recognize the significance of President Obama's announcement of a timeline for withdrawal beginning in July 2011, I do not believe we have the luxury to wait a year to begin this process.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

## INTRODUCTION OF END RACIAL PROFILING ACT OF 2010

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 15, 2010*

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the End Racial Profiling Act of 2010, along with additional cosponsors. As a product of years of extensive consultation with both the law enforcement and civil rights communities, this legislation represents the most comprehensive federal commitment to healing the rift caused by racial profiling and restoring public confidence in the criminal justice system at-large. The introduction of this legislation is a critical step in what should be a nationwide, bipartisan effort to end this divisive practice.

The debate over racial profiling has become a central element in a much larger history of adversarial relationships between the police and communities of color. Over the past two decades, the tensions between police and minority communities have grown as allegations of racial profiling by law enforcement agents, sometimes supported by data collection efforts, have increased in number and frequency. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and the ongoing immigration enforcement debate have only complicated the profiling issues that were traditionally centered on state and local law enforcement.

The arrest of Harvard Professor Henry Louis Gates and the passage of Arizona S.B. 1070 have crystalized the terms of the profiling debate and demonstrate that the combination of race and law enforcement represents a volatile mix across all strata of the minority community. Despite the fact that the majority of law enforcement officers perform their duties professionally and without bias—and we value their service highly—the specter of racial profiling has contaminated the relationship between the police and minority communities to such a degree that Federal action is justified to begin addressing the issue.

When I first introduced the Traffic Stops Statistics Study Act of 1997, the racial profiling issue was relatively straightforward in political terms. Profiling was represented by the classic pretext traffic stop, where an African-American driver was pulled over for a minor traffic violation and then asked for consent to search their vehicle. Today, traffic and pedestrian stops have given way to airport passenger profiles and immigrant sweeps. For that reason, racial profiling legislation has evolved from a simple data collection bill to comprehensive multi-tiered legislation—including a private right of action and best practice grants—that is designed to address a more complex law enforcement landscape.

As we move forward, I believe it is important to remind Members of just how far we in Congress have come in developing a bipartisan consensus on the racial profiling issue. By September 11, 2001, there was significant empirical evidence and wide agreement among Americans, including President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft, that racial profiling was a tragic fact of life in the minority community and that the Federal government should take action to end the practice.

Data collected from Ohio, Michigan, Florida, Louisiana, New York, Maryland, Maine, Rhode Island, California, West Virginia, and Oklahoma demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that African-Americans and Hispanics were being stopped for routine traffic violations far in excess of their share of the population or even the rate at which such populations are accused of criminal conduct. Similarly, Justice Department reports found that although African-Americans and Hispanics were more likely to be stopped and searched by law enforcement, they were much less likely to be found in possession of contraband.

Law enforcement officials have similarly evolved in their views. While some still take issue, many in the law enforcement community acknowledge that singling out people for heightened scrutiny based on their race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin has eroded the trust in law enforcement necessary to appropriately serve and protect our communities. Rather than seeking to deny the concerns of minority community advocates, law enforcement officials have joined the effort to create solutions and build trust with their communities. As a result, more than 20 states have passed bipartisan legislation prohibiting racial profiling and/or mandating data collection on stops and searches, in addition to hundreds of individual jurisdictions which have voluntarily commenced to collect data programs.

Congress itself was actually poised to pass racial profiling legislation in the fall of 2001, with the express support of President Bush, before the terrorist attacks changed the legislative paradigm. In the wake of the attacks, however, the Department of Justice promulgated a series of guidelines in 2003 which were designed to end the practice of racial profiling by federal law enforcement agencies. These measures do not reach the vast majority of racial profiling complaints arising from the routine activities of state and local law enforcement agencies. Further, the guidelines provide no enforcement mechanism or methods for identifying law enforcement agencies not in compliance. Consequently, they fail to resolve the racial profiling problem nationwide. In this instance, there is no substitute for comprehensive federal anti-profiling legislation.

The End Racial Profiling Act is designed to enforce the constitutional right to equal protection of the laws by eliminating racial profiling through changes to the policies and procedures underlying the practice. First, the bill